

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 04450 01 OF 02 162126Z

70

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03 INR-11 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

DRC-01 /153 W

----- 097546

R 162030Z AUG 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7186

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY BONN

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 4450

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: AUGUST 14 WG DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PAPERS ON  
GROUND FORCE DEFINITION, IMPLICATIONS OF USE OF ALLIED  
DATA, AND AIR MANPOWER

REF: A. USNATO 4341

B. USNATO 4236

C. USNATO 4310

D. USNATO 4253

E. STATE 176658

F. STATE 176622

SUMMARY: WG AUGUST 14 CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF ITS THREE DRAFTS  
RELATIVE TO IMPLICATION OF DATA, GROUND FORCE RE-DEFINITION  
QUESTION, AND INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER. DISCUSSION LARGELY  
COLORED BY UK POSITION THAT DECISION ON CHOICE OF ANY GROUND FORCE  
RE-DEFINITION OPTION SHOULD AWAIT ALLIED AND WP AGREEMENT ON AN  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04450 01 OF 02 162126Z

ACCEPTANLE DATA BASE. WG AGREED THAT REVISED DRAFTS SHOULD BE  
PREPARED FOR CONSIDERATION AT NEXT MEETING, AUGUST 27. TEXTS  
BEING TRANSMITTED SEPTELS. MEANWHILE WG CHAIRMAN AGREED TO  
REPORT ORALLY TO SPC DURING WEEK OF AUGUST 19 ON STATUS OF WG

DISCUSSIONS. END SUMMARY.

1. AT ITS AUGUST 14 MEETING, WORKING GROUP AGAIN TOOK UP REVISED DRAFTS OF ITS PAPERS ON (1) DATA AND DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES (TEXT REF A );(2) IMPLICATIONS OF REVISED ALLIED DATA (TEXT REF B AS AMENDED BY REF C); AND (3) PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF IMPLICATIONS OF INCLUDING AIR MANPOWER (TEXT REF D).

2. SHAPE REP (NEUBROCH) FOCUSED ON MAIN ISSUE WHICH DOMINATED LENGTHY DISCUSSION OF FIRST TWO PAPERS WHEN HE POINTED OUT THAT RECURRING PROBLEM IN BOTH OF THEM WAS NOT QUESTION OF WHAT FIGURES THE WP EVENTUALLY DECLARES, BUT RATHER THOSE WHICH ARE FINALLY AGREED TO BY ALLIED AND WP NEGOTIATORS. HE THEREFORE ASKED THAT THIS IDEA BE INTRODUCED IN PARAS 10(4TH SENTENCE); 15E (5TH SENTENCE); AND 32B&C AT APPROPRIATE POINTS. FRG REP (BRUCKMANN) AGREED WITH THIS GENERAL APPROACH AND ADDED THAT BONN WISHED IN ANY CASE TO DELETE PHRASE: "AND COLD FALL WELL BELOW THAT FIGURE" DOWN TO "ARMY AVIATION", APPEARING IN FOURTH SENTENCE OF PARA 10, IN ORDER NOT TO PREJUDGE OUTCOME OF WHAT FIGURES ALLIES MIGHT FINALLY BE PREPARED TO ACCEPT. IN LIGHT OF WASHINGTONS VIEW EXPRESSED IN PARA 4D OF (REF E), US REP INTERPOSED NO OBJECTION.

3. UK REP (GEHARTY) ALSO ENDORSED SHAPE REPS POINTS, AND THEREUPON CIRCULATED NUMEROUS AMENDMENTS TO BOTH PAPERS, SEVERAL OF WHICH ADDRESSED THIS QUESTION. (WE ARE POUCHING TO STATE/RPM AND DOD/ISA). HE ADDED THAT LONDON FIRMLY BELIEVED THAT ACCURACY OF NATO FIGURES WAS NOT THE MAIN ISSUE TO FOCUS ON. INSTEAD IT WAS WHETHER THE WP WOULD AGREE WITH ALLIED FIGURES, AND FAILING THAT, WHAT THE FIGURES WOULD BE WHICH WERE FINALLY AGREED BY BOTH SIDES AS A BASIS FOR UNDERTAKING REDUCTIONS. FROM A MILITARY AND TECHNICAL STANDPOINT, CHARACTER OF THE FIGURES FINALLY AGREED TO WITH THE AST COULD HAVE AN IMPORTANT BEARING ON THE CHOICE OF THE REDEFINITION OPTION. WHILE RECOGNIZING THAT THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE TO TAKE POLITICAL FACTORS INTO CONSIDERATION IN SELECTING ANY OF THE FOUR OPTIONS, HE  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 04450 01 OF 02 162126Z

ADDED THAT LONDONS PREFERRED MILITARY VIEW WAS THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT AGREE TO ANY OPTION AT ALL UNTIL THE ALLIES KNOW WHAT THE AGREED DATA BASE WOULD BE. ONLY THEN COULD THEY FULLY APPRECIATE WHAT EFFECTS A GROUND FORCE REDEFINITION OPTION COULD HAVE ON (A) THE SIZE OF FORCES (ESPECIALLY COMBAT CAPABLE FORMATIONS) WHICH THEY MIGHT HAVE TO REDUCE, AND (B) THE DEGREE OF DISPARITY IN RELATIVE FORCES AND COMBAT CAPABILITY WHICH MIGHT STILL OBTAIN AFTER REDUCTIONS. IF THE WG WERE TO GIVE USEFUL MILITARY ADVICE TO NATOS POLITICAL AUTHORITIES, THIS POINT SHOULD BE HIGHLIGHTED IN PAPER.

4. US REP SAID THAT, WHILE HE HAD NO SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ON FIRST PAPER, HE WOULD SPEAK TO GENERAL ISSUE UK REP RAISED IN

CONTEXT OF SECOND PAPER, ESPECIALLY WITH RESPECT TO PARA 19 OF LATTER. MEANWHILE HE WOULD HAVE TO RESERVE ON AT LEAST ONE OF THE THREE NEW "FINDINGS" WHICH UK WISHED TO INTRODUCE IN PAR 32G OF FIRST PAPER, WHICH READ: "THE ACCEPTANCE BY NATO OF CASES 1, 2 OR 3 WOULD INVOLVE THE TAKING OF A CALCULATED RISK UNTIL THE WP DECLARES TO NATO ITS OWN DATA BASE FOR USE IN NEGOTIATIONS." (THIS PHRASE SUBSEQUENTLY AMENDED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT SHAPE REPS IDEA OF NATO ACCEPTING THESE FIGURES.)

5. LENGTHY DISCUSSION THEN ENSUED WITH ACTING WG CHAIRMAN (WILDRIDK) TAKING ISSUE WITH UK PERCEPTION OF PRIORITY. SPEAKING PERSONALLY, HE SAID THAT IT WAS NOT CLEAR THAT ALLIES WOULD BE TAKING A RISK IN SELECTING ANY ONE OF THE RE-DEFINITION OPTIONS AT THIS TIME. THE CENTRAL QUESTION WAS WHAT FORCES WERE TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REDUCTION BASE AND HOW MANY WERE THEN TO BE ACTUALLY REDUCED. AN EFFECTIVE NATO DEFENSE CAPABILITY WAS BASED ON SUFFICIENT AND PROPERLY CONFIGURED POST-REDUCTION FORCES, NOT ORIGINAL TOTALS. UK REP REPLIED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES (WHO REGARDED PAPER WITH CONSIDERABLE IMPORTANCE) WOULD NOT ACCEPT PAPER WITHOUT INCLUSION OF AT LEAST SOME WARNING, FROM MILITARY POINT OF VIEW, OF HAZARDS OF REDEFINING GROUND FORCES AS LONG AS AN AGREED NATO/WP DATA BASE IS UNKNOWN. AFTER FURTHER INCONCLUSIVE DISCUSSION AS TO WHETHER CURRENT DRAFT ADEQUATELY REFLECTED THE HAZARDS IN TERMS OF SPECIFIC EXAMPLES AND DETAILS, CHAIRMAN PROPOSED TO BUILD IN FURTHER EXAMPLES SUGGESTED BY UK ON CASE 2 (PARA 20 REF A TEXT) AND THEN ISSUE A RE-DRAFT OF FIRST PAPER INCORPORATING HIGHLIGHTS OF PRECEEDING CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 04450 01 OF 02 162126Z

DISCUSSION (WE ARE TRANSMITTING NEW TEXT SEPTEL).

6. TURNING TO PAPER ON IMPLICATIONS OF ALLIED DATA (TEXT REF B), CHAIRMAN ASKED IF THERE WERE ANY COMMENTS. US REP DREW FULLY ON REF E, URGING THAT SINCE "FINDINGS" SECTION CONTRIBUTED NOTHING TO WHAT WAS AN ALREADY SUCCINCT PAPER, IT SHOULD BE DROPPED. ENUMERATING POINTS IN PARAS 2 AND 3 OF REF E, HE PROPOSED THAT LAST PORTION OF NEW PARA 18 ALSO BE DELETED.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 04450 02 OF 02 162158Z

70

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 AEC-11 CIAE-00 H-03 INR-11 IO-14

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-04 OMB-01 PA-04 PM-07 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-03 SS-20 USIA-15 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-07

DRC-01 /153 W

----- 097892

R 162030Z AUG 74  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7187  
SECDEF WASHDC  
INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USNCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 4450

7. ON LATTER POINT UK VIGOROUSLY OBJECTED AND RECALLED HIS EARLIER REMARKS ON HIGH DEGREE OF PRIORITY HIS AUTHORITIES ATTACHED TO ACHIEVING AN AGREED SET OF FIGURES. CALLING ATTENTION TO POINT US REP HAD MADE AS DRAWN FROM PARA 5 OF REF E, HE SAID THAT THIS WAS PRECISE APPROCACH UK FAVORED, BUT FOR THAT VERY REASON FELT STRONGLY THAT QUESTION SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED AND DISCUSSED BOTH IN THIS AND PREVIOUS PAPER. IN VIEW OF US POSITION, HOWEVER, UK REP SAID HE MIGHT BE PREPARED TO DELETE PORTIONS OF NEW PARA 18 BEGINNING WITH "THE WP IN THE COURSE OF..." DOWN TO END OF NEXT SENTENCE READING "BETWEEN THE STRENGTHS OF THE TWO BLOCS." LAST SENTENCE, HOWEVER, SHOULD REMAIN FOR REASONS HE HAD PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED AT LENGTH. US REP SAID HE WOULD UNDERTAKE TO REPORT UKS PROPOSED COMPROMISE.

8. ON US PROPOSAL TO DELETE FINDINGS, UK REP SAID THAT SINCE SEVERAL CONTRARY INTERPRETATIONS HAD ALREADY BEEN DRAWN FROM TEXT DURING PREVIOUS WG DISCUSSIONS, IT CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 04450 02 OF 02 162158Z

SEEMED OBVIOUS THAT CLEAR STATEMENT OF AGREED CONCLUSIONS SHOULD APPEAR. DUTCH REP (SIZOO) STRONGLY ENDORSED UK VIEW ON FINDINGS AND BELIEVED THEY WERE ESSENTIAL. OTHERS GENERALLY AGREED.

9. DISCUSSION THEN TURNED TO MAJOR SUBSTANTIVE UK AMENDMENT PROPOSED IN UK REPS HAND OUT, WHICH RELATED TO DELETION OF CURRENT SENTENCE IN PARA 16A DN SUBSTITUTION OF FOLLOWING: "THIS REDUCTION OF AN ADDITIONAL 2,000 MEN BORNE ACROSS THE NATO FORCES IN THE NGA, WOULD PROBABLY BE ACCEPTABLE PROVIDED IT DID NOT INCLUDE COMBAT OR COMBAT SUPPORT UNITS. IF SUCH UNITS HAD TO BE INCLUDED, IT WOULD BE BETTER MILITARILY FOR NATO TO ACCEPT A HIGHER COMMON CEILING FIGURE THAN 712,000- FOR EXAMPLE, 714,000 OR EVEN 715,000".

10. CHAIRMAN SAID UK PROPOSAL COMPLETELY ALTERED SENSE AND LOGIC OF ORIGINAL PHRASE, WHILE ALSO INTRODUCING AN ENTIRELY

NEW IDEA AT END OF SENTENCE. HE ASKED WHETHER UK COULD ACCEPT CURRENT LANGUAGE FOR PARA 16 IF PHRASE "WOULD POSSIBLY BE ACCEPTABLE" WERE USED AT END OF LAST SENTENCE INSTEAD OF " WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE". UK REP THOUGHT HE COULD ACCEPT PROPOSAL. DISCUSSION ENDED WITH CHAIRMAN PROPOSING TO WORK OUT NEW DRAFT WHICH WOULD IDENTIFY PROPOSED COMPROMISE FOR NEW PARA 18, CHANGE PAR 16 AS INDICATED ABOVE, AND IDENTIFY US PROPOSAL FOR DROPPING FINDINGS SECTION ENTIRELY. WE ARE TRANSMITTING NEW TEXT OF THIS PAPER SEPTEL AS WELL.

11. COMMENT. THIS MEETING REPRESENTS THIRD CONSECUTIVE OCCASION WHERE UK HAS INTRODUCED RELATIVELY LENGTHY AMENDMENTS. UK ACTION HAS HAD EFFECT OF DELAYING AGREEMENT TO PAPERS ON WHICH THERE HAS BEEN AN EMERGING CONSENSUS, AND WHICH ARE REQUIRED FOR SPC TO BEGIN PROCESS OF AGREEING TO AN ACCEPTABLE REDEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. WE CANNOT DETERMINE AT THIS POINT HOW FIRM UK POSITION IS ON DEFERRING REDEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES QUESTION UNTIL AN ALLIED/WP AGREED DATA BASE IS IDENTIFIED, ALTHOUGH THIS WAS CLEARLY THE MAIN ISSUE TO EMERGE FROM AUGUST 14 WG DISCUSSION. UK PAPER ON USE OF DATA DISTRIBUTED AT AUGUST 12 SPC MEETING (TEXT USNATO 4410) DOES NOT SUGGEST THAT NECESSITY OF AGREEING TO DATA SHOULD BE PRE-CONDITION TO AGREEING TO A REDEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES. UK POSITION MAY THEREFORE BE SIMPLY A FURTHER MANIFESTATION OF UK CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 04450 02 OF 02 162158Z

MILITARYS BASIC AND WELL KNOWN PREOCCUPATION OF SEEKING TO INSURE THAT NATO POST REDUCTION GROUND COMBAT CAPABILITY IS NOT SERIOUSLY DEGRADED. END COMMENT.

12. TURNING FINALLY TO AIR MANPOWER PAPER (TEXT REF D), CHAIRMAN ASKED WHETHER ALLIES FOUND GENERAL THRUST ACCEPTABLE. FRG, UK AND DUTCH SAID THEY DID, BUT UK REP SUGGESTED THAT IT COULD BE FURTHER ELABORATED IN TERMS OF SPECIFICS. DUTCH OFFERED TO PROVIDE A TERMS OF REFERENCE PAPER FOR A BROADER TREATMENT OF SUBJECT. US REP SAID TIME WAS NOT RIPE FOR SUCH AN EXPANDED STUDY AND NATO POLITICAL AUTHORITIES IN ANY CASE DID NOT NEED IT AT THIS TIME. DRAWING ON REF F, HE ALSO SUGGESTED THAT DISCUSSION OF "COSMETIC" TREATMENT OF AIR MANPOWER SHOULD GIVE WAY TO IDENTIFICATION OF EXPLICIT WAYS IN WHICH AIR POWER COULD BE INCLUDED IN MBFR. HE THEN LISTED THE THREE OPTIONS SET FORTH IN PARA 3 OF REF F. DUTCH REP FOUND US REASONING AND APPROACH HELPFUL AND AGREED TO DEFER PROPOSAL OF A TERMS OF REFERENCE PAPER. THEY ALSO AGREED, AND CHAIRMAN THEREUPON SAID HE WOULD PREPARE A REVISED DRAFT OF PAPER. WE WILL TRANSMIT WHEN RECEIVED.

13. WG AGREED TO MEET AUGUST 27 TO CONSIDER AND HOPEFULLY WRAP UP THREE PAPERS. MEANWHILE, AND IN VIEW OF SPC INTEREST IN SUBJECT, ALLIES ASKED CHAIRMAN TO REPORT ORALLY DURING WEEK OF AUGUST 19 ON STATUS OF PAPERS, BUT WITHOUT COMMITTING WG TO ANY FINDINGS AT THIS STAGE. MCAULIFFE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 16 AUG 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO04450  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740888/abbrywrk.tel  
**Line Count:** 272  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 4341 B. USNATO 4236 C. USNATO 4310 D. USNATO 4253 E. STATE 176658 F. STATE 176622  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 19 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <19 MAR 2002 by shawdg>; APPROVED <15 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: AUGUST 14 WG DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PAPERS ON GROUND FORCE DATA, AND AIR MANPOWER DEFINITION, IMPLICATIONS OF USE OF ALLIED  
**TAGS:** PARM NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO LONDON  
BONN  
MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005